

## REMARKS

1-3. Applicants do not believe that Claims 109, 126, 163, and 166 as now twice amended, are anticipated by Uehara '543 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claim 109 has been further amended to recite that steps D-F are accomplished with respect to another control device in steps G-I. New step J recites that the control device that issued the respective command in steps D and G is remembered after the respective command is issued thus clearly distinguishing Uehara. The present invention remembers each control device that has issued a command and remembers the device after other devices have issued commands. Uehara does not remember the control device as the Examiner pointed out.

Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's assertion that "identifying the control device that issued the command" is somehow inherent in Uehara. It is not necessary that the control devices of Uehara identify themselves uniquely and, even if it were otherwise, the "identifying" of Uehara exists only when the device is transmitting.

Claim 126 has now been amended to associate each control device with each camera which is a feature not recited by Uehara. Moreover, the control devices that issued commands are remembered after a respective command has been issued.

Claim 163 as now been amended to recite that at least two control devices each issue a command and are identified by the automatic control means and the identifying data associated with each device is remembered after the respective command is sent. Uehara does not remember which device is which and would have no reason to have this capability.

Claim 166 as now amended to recite that the at least two control devices each issue commands and each device command results in a changed field of view. Further each control device issuing a command is remember after the command has been issued.

Accordingly, Claims 109 (Twice Amended), 126 (Twice Amended), 163 (Twice Amended), 166 (Twice Amended) are clearly not anticipated by Uehara under 35 102(e) and are believed to be nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

4-5. Applicants believe that Claims 110-125, 127-137, 141-162, and 164 as now amended, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and not obvious in view of Uehara and Park '296. Claim 110 now depends on Claim 109 (Twice Amended) which recites in step G: "remembering the control device that issued the respective command in step D and G after respective command has been

issued” and does so for the control devices of both steps D, E and F and steps G, H and I. Uehara does not disclose remembering the control device as the Examiner pointed out. Moreover, Parker ‘296 also does not disclose this feature. The present invention not only remembers the device that issued a command but remembers the control device even after another control device has issued a command. This is far afield from remembering the control device only while it is actually sending a command. Claim 110 is neither anticipated by Uehara nor obvious in light of Uehara and Parker and is not taught or suggested by the cited art.

Claims 111-125, 127-137, 141-162 and 164 are believed to be patentable over the art in the same manner as the respective independent claims and the specific steps recited in the dependent claims.

With regard to Claim 127, Claim 126 has been twice amended in a manner such that it is not anticipated by Uehara as discussed hereinabove and is not obvious even when combined with Parker ‘296. Claim 127 depends on Claim 126 (Twice Amended) and is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art.

With regard to Claims 141-162, Claim 141 now depends on Claim 126 (Twice Amended) and is not taught or suggested by the cited art for the reasons stated hereinabove.

With regard to Claim 164, Claim 164 now depends on Claim 163 (Twice Amended), which incorporated the subject matter of Claim 165 previously cancelled. Claim 163 (Twice Amended) recites remembering identifying information that identifies a respective control device. Accordingly, Claim 163 (Twice Amended) and Claim 164 are not anticipated or obvious in view of the cited art.

6. Claims 138-140 are believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Uehara, Parker, and Sano. Claim 138 recites a group of control devices at a single site as contrasted to Sano’s plurality of conference sites. Claims 138-140 are directed to the control of audio signals from the control devices being used which are not found in any of the applied prior art. Claim 126 (Twice Amended) recites at least two control devices on which Claims 138-140 depend. In practice there may be several control devices in use and this feature is not found in the prior art.

Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 138-140 are not obvious in light of the cited art.

With respect to all the various individuality treated claims in the above Office Action, while it may be true that Uehara, Parker, and even Sano disclose some of the features of the claims, it is

not at all obvious in light of the cited art that they be employed with the features of the other prior art without reverence to various methods and steps of the present invention. The presently claimed system employs both identifying and remembering which control device issues what command so as to coordinate the activities of the system users. Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 109 (Twice Amended), 125, 126 (Twice Amended), 162, 163 (Twice Amended), 164, and Claim 166 (Twice Amended) are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) or rendered obvious by any appropriate combination of the cited art under 35 U.S.C. 103.

A telephone interview is respectfully requested to resolve any remaining issue prior to any further action on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Arthur G. Yeager, Reg. No. 19,892

Suite 1305  
112 West Adams Street  
Jacksonville, FL 32202-3853  
(904) 355-9631: Tel  
(904) 355-9632: Fax

3/15/01